STAN ROLARK: Good afternoon. My name is Stan Rolark. I'm the Census Bureau's Public Information Officer. Thank you all for coming today. You know, it's been a while since we were last here so we are very happy to be here again at the National Press Club to give you updates on the 2010 Census. So today our director, Dr. Robert Groves will come up and he will talk to you a little bit about quality indicators from the 2010 Census. He will also at about the Count Question Resolution Program. And then we will tell you some things that we expect to come out down the pike.

Before I bring up Dr. Groves, let me just give you a little information about how we will proceed today. So we have people in the audience and we also have people on the phone. Let me thank all of the callers today. We will take questions and answers once Dr. Groves has completed his presentation. So if you are calling in on the phone, be sure to let the operator know that you have a question so he or she can put you into the queue.

Let me also remind you that you can go to our Web site, www.census.gov and you can get information on this press conference as well as the slides that Dr. Groves will be showing today and other information that you may find useful as well. If you have any questions, please feel free to call the Public Information Office. That number is 301-763-3030. I almost gave you my home phone number. [Laughter]

So, okay. With that, let me bring up Dr. Groves. Dr. Groves?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Thank you, Stan. Good afternoon. I want to do three things today. We will update you on new evaluation results from the 2010 Census. We will talk a little about the Count Question Resolution Program, which

is an effort to react to local jurisdictions that see apparent anomalies in the 2010 Census. And then I'll talk a little bit about the new products coming out.

Before I begin, though, I want to note that this is kind of a special day for us at the Census Bureau. We have concluded today the release of state-by-state files from the 2010 Census File. We call these the Summary File 1's. And they provide detailed information, including cross tabulations of age and sex, households, families, relationships to householders, housing units, detailed race and Hispanic and Latino origin groups and group quarters. This is really a major achievement that we've done on schedule. So I want to congratulate the staff, the hard working staff back in Suitland on succeeding in that great endeavor.

I can tell you most of our work right now is focused on evaluating the 2010 Census. This is an important part of us getting better over time, learning from weaknesses of one census and improving the next census. So I want to update you. I promised you months ago that we would do this routinely and this is our coming through on our promise. As I said at that time, there are three ways that we evaluate a census. One, we have a set of indicators that we watch during the process of collecting the data. And I have an update on those, those final estimates.

Two, we have comparisons of multiple ways of estimating the population size in the country and we have a little update on that. And then finally, the third way is we mount a very large, sample survey with the highest quality measurement we can invent at the time, within cost constraints, called a post enumeration survey. And we match the results of that to the decennial census in order to evaluate the census. So I'm going to go through updates on each of those three.

First let's start with process indicators. I remind you that we have already revealed a set of those indicators and they go in good and bad directions, mainly

good. For example, we collected relatively more data at the non-response follow up stage, not from people who lived in the household but from neighbors and building managers. Twenty-two percent of the non-response follow-up cases were collected with so-called proxy respondents versus 17 percent in the prior census. We view this as a negative indicator because we'd prefer people living in the households to report themselves.

Despite that, at the national level, we obtained usable housing unit information from slightly more records in this census than the prior census. These are very high rates, 99.6 percent in 2010 versus 99.4 or 5 percent, a slight increase and very high numbers for both. And we view this as a positive outcome.

So I have a couple of new things to show you on that. And I have to take you back to some definitions we used in the 2010 Census. We were providing day-by-day something we call the participation rate, down to very small areas of geographies. Looking back on this, we think it was a wonderful thing to do for the country because local jurisdictions track the rate of mail back day by day. This rate was defined by this ration, where the numerator is all of the forms that were mailed back from house successfully. And the denominator were all the ones we miles out. But then we subtracted off the forms that we mailed out that came back unsuccessfully delivered.

Now, why would we do that? Some of the addresses in our address frame weren't connected with households. We knew that. We didn't know the full extent of that at the time we were calculating the participation rates. As a proxy, as a weak substitute for that we took, we assumed all the undeliverable forms were actually associated with addresses that weren't connected with people living in them. And you may recall that at the end of all of our work, at the end of the full census, 74.4 percent was our participation rate defined according to that numerator / denominator I just mentioned. Prior to non-response follow-up, that was a 71%

rate. And then during non-response follow-up, some forms, some added forms came in.

Well, at this time we can clean up that denominator basically. And so we can give today something that has traditionally been called the return rate. It has the same numerator to it. But the denominator now is cleaned up in the sense that based on the census returns we know which of all of the addresses we mailed out and delivered to were actually occupied. It's only the occupied units that could mail back a form. So this is a rate, you can think of it, of those households that could possibly have mailed a form because people live in those units, what proportion did.

And we can compare these rates between 2000 and 2010. If we look at the 2000 bar here, at the end of the mail-out – mail-back phase in 2000 that rate, about 74 percent of the occupied households had returned the form. We got about 4.3 percent during the non-response follow-up stage for a total of 78.4 percent. And you can see the comparable numbers, slightly higher in 2010 than in 2000. And that's a good sign. We view this as a good indicator and these are numbers that are now stable and we understand both numerators and denominators. So these are final numbers on this side.

So we see a slight increase in the return rate for 2010 versus 2000. And we think there are three reasons why those rates are different. Before I give these, I should really note our other sample surveys of households, the response rates on those surveys have been declining throughout the decade 2000 to 2010. The fact that this rate is even comparable and somewhat higher is really quite pleasing. We think there are three reasons. We have actually four reasons; three of them we have data on.

First, I remind us that this was the first short form only census of this country. In the year 2000 the return rate for the long form, which was given to about one-sixth of the households was about nine percentage points less than the return rate for the short form. Having a short form only census we infer was a good idea and helped us achieve that higher rate. Secondly, for the first time we had a replacement form when we didn't receive the form we sent out, a lot of replacement forms.

That appeared to work. Our estimate now is that about 2.3 percent of the households returned, of the total return rate was due to that replacement form. So let me comment on that for a minute. We got a 2.3 percentage gain because of the replacement form. Our estimate is that about every one percentage point of the return rate was about $80 or $90 million dollars saved. If you do a little arithmetic, it looked like we saved about $200 million dollars because of the replacement form. These are rough estimates but important as an assessment of whether it was worth printing and sending out those replacement forms. I think that we can now say that seemed to pay off.

And then the final answer to why did we do better this time we think is the bilingual form sent to a subset of the areas that disproportionately we projected had Spanish speaking residents. We think we got about a two percentage point gain in those areas. And for all of those reasons we think we did better. And there is one that we can't really quantify but we are absolutely convinced without the numbers. And that is the success of the partnership program in thousands of communities around the country, seemed to be noticeably better this time, and that was the use of trusted voices in a variety of communities to get the word out the mailing back the form was, indeed, an important thing to do.

From this process indicator and these sorts of calculations we can give out one other finding. It's an important one. It is more a commentary on how the country

changed and how the housing stock has changed. And that is we picked up, as we gave you suspicions of in our earlier press conferences, there are more vacant units in 2010 than in 2000.

So these are what we call universe size of figures that you can see on this chart. On the left-hand side you see the 2000 figures. And that 118 million, you can think of as the total number of addresses that we sent a questionnaire out through the mail or we delivered the questionnaire to. And of those addresses 101 million of them were occupied units. Contrast that with this decade where the housing stock has grown in size to 130 million. That includes all the addresses, once again, that we delivered or mailed to. And of those 108 million were occupied.

The difference between the 130 million and the 108 million is both the occupancy rate but also the number of addresses on the form that were actually later deleted in operations. So to clarify this, in 2010, if you focus on the vacancies themselves, there were about 15 million vacant housing units in the nation versus about 10 million in 2000. That's an increase of about 43.8 percent. That is a commentary we believe about the housing crisis that the country was going through in 2010 and still suffers from.

We can break that now down by very small areas. This is a national map by counties where the colors are coded by the increase in the vacancy, the change in the vacancy rate. So if you just look at this, glancing at this and focus on the orange or brown areas, those are areas where there is an increase in the vacancy rate, the counties that had increased vacancy rate between 2000 and 2010. And the map is mainly orange and brown. And that shows how pervasive the change in the vacancy rate and the increase in vacancies were across the country.

Nevada led all of the states with both the largest percent increase in total housing units and the largest percent increase in gross vacancy rates during the decade.

Philadelphia, among cities, was one of the five of the ten most populous cities to have a gross vacancy rate above 10 percent. However, ironically, it's the only city among the 10 most populous to experience a decrease in its gross rate during the decade. So even though it had a high rate, that's one case that actually went down throughout the decade.

I want to turn—these were process indicators, using our lingo. I want to turn to the second evaluative method that we have and that is comparing different ways of estimating the population between one another. And I'll remind us the chief method we have is called demographic analysis. We released in December, for the first time a range of demographic analyses. These are methods that are based on vital records principally. I'll mention this in a minute.

We released a range of those. This chart shows the five different estimates for the total population that we released because there was an agreement among the community of demographers that estimating the immigrant portion of the population was, indeed, difficult to get consensus on numbers. And about 70 percent of the range across those five numbers is due to logical, plausibly different assumptions about the size of the immigrant pool.

I note, as this chart notes, that when the 2010 Census data came in, the count that we got from the 2010 Census sort of falls nicely in the middle of that range. This was a pleasant result from our viewpoint. We can now start drilling down by age groups in this comparison between demographic analysis in the census. And that's what I want to talk about now. I remind us in that regard that we use slightly different methods for different age groups.

And this chart, hopefully, will describe again to you how we do this. For the population, look on the left-hand side of this chart. For the population zero to 64, we use birth records, death records. We get estimates of net internal migration,

international migration. And then we add in counts from the armed forces overseas. But we actually use a different method for those who are 65 and older. We rely on records from Medicare and then we rely on estimates of the take-up rate of Medicare, the estimates of under enrollment.

As you see below in that yellow portion, the estimate from demographic analysis of the population is a simple combination of those terms. So what I'd like to take you through now is kind of a historical review of contrast by ages between demographic analysis and censuses. And I'll start with the 1990 census and begin to make a variety of commentaries about this chart. The horizontal axis on this chart are age groups. We have single age groups plotted here. The vertical axis are population totals, as estimated in thousands. And these are 1990 data.

The big green masts that you see are the—the height of that is the counts from the 1990 census by age. The black lines are comparable estimates based on demographic analysis. And there are a few things to comment on. Let your eye go immediately way to the left of that chart and you see a steep decline in the height near the zero age. This was actually a learning experience in 1990. We asked parents to report the age of their children. And we didn't ask them to report the date of birth of their children. And many parents who had a young baby reported the age as one, avoiding zero or four months or something like that. This was actually, we believe, a measurement property of the 1990 census that was undesirable and we changed it. So that is a little note on the tail end of that.

The next thing to note is this area covered by this red ellipse that I just put on the screen. And this is a signal in 1990 of something that is seen in every census of every country I've ever seen. And that is the difficulty of—most people look at this and say, there is a difficulty in enumerating in censuses children of between zero and 10, zero and eight, depending on how you are looking at the data. Remember that as we go through the years.

The second thing to note is in 1990, this tendency to get higher census counts than demographic analysis estimates in the teenage years, the late teenage years. And then finally, the shape of the curve, just to remind us why our age distribution looks this way, that big bump is the Baby Boom. And this point right here that shows this huge decline is the beginning of the Baby Boom. As we move from 1990 to later decades, you are going to see that hump move 10 years every time as the Baby Boomers age through the population.

So these were the basic findings, the contrast between demographic analysis and the census in 1990. Here is the same thing for 2000. So what do we see here? Notice that at the very far left that anomaly between zero and one year old had apparently disappeared. The measurement of age changed. We asked parents to report both the age of the young baby and the date of birth. And that seemed to clean up that anomaly.

But the same pattern of lower census counts of kids, young kids, versus demographic analysis estimates appears in 2000 as it did in 1990. You see in 2000 this higher census counts than demographic analysis in the teenage years. And then here is another note of the Baby Boom. So for the first time we can do the same chart for the 2010 Census. You'll immediately see something is different in the demographic analysis pattern, the curve over there. It's a thick line. That thick line reflects that fact that we have measured and reflected in the graph the uncertainty of the demographic analysis estimates based on these different, plausible assumptions.

So let's now parse this. If we go and we see the traditional, lower census counts than demographic analysis estimates for the young children, we see the same pattern of higher census counts than demographic analysis for the teens. And then we see a new feature around the 65-year age of higher demographic analysis than

the census counts. I want to drill into that just a bit. And one way to do it is to transform what we just saw into a comparison between the year 2000 and the year 2010.

So let me help you through this. The horizontal access is the same, ages. The vertical axis now, contrast the census to demographic analysis. Notice the zero line horizontally. All the points above that zero line are points where that age group had higher census counts than demographic analysis. Everything below is the opposite.

So now let's look at that pattern. If you squint, the pattern is pretty consistent. There are two differences that are notable. One is, if you notice the younger age groups, it appears that in 2010 there are more cases of demographic analysis being higher than the census or that difference is somewhat larger in 2010 than 2000. And then you can let your eye go across and hit the age groups, 55 through about 67 or so, and you see that here we are getting higher census counts in (?) demographic analysis in 2010. And it's less so, less true in 2000.

We are particularly interested in that dramatic shift around the age 65. Why are we interested in that? Well, remember, that is that break point for how we do demographic analysis. When we go into ages 65 and older we flip from vital registrations to Medicare as the base. So our wonderful demographers are drilling into these two anomalies right now and asking the question, what is that telling us about demographic analysis? What is it telling us about the 2010 Census?

So that is, indeed where we are on demographic analysis. I can tell you that our demographers are also focused on one thing. And that is, we are able to break these figures by race. The only race break we can do is African-American – non-African-American, given the nature of vital records. We're doing that right now. I can give you a peak at one feature of that result. You know, if you have been

following the census story already that the number of people who are recording themselves as multiracial is increasing. We measure multiracial characteristics in the census. The vital records don't.

So what do we—the classification of someone as African-American alone versus African-American and some other race makes a difference in the comparison between demographic analysis and the census. And we're grappling with that issue right now. We will be able to show you this in the coming weeks. It's a fascinating story that will be told there.

So, let me just kind of summarize where we are, if you needed an overview of the comparison of demographic analysis and the census far. Number one, the patterns of differences between the census counts and the demographic analysis estimates are very familiar to us. They look very similar to prior censuses. Those in '90 and 2000 I showed you. The census counts tend to be lower than the demographic analysis estimates for kids under 10 years old. The census counts are higher that demographic analysis estimates for ages in the late teens. And you can track the Baby Boom movement in both of these things quite easily.

So, I want to move on to the third method of evaluating the census. So we've done process indicators. We've done demographic analysis. Let me tell you where we are on the post-enumeration survey, which will give us estimates of under count for different sub groups. We have completed all the data collection in the field and our statisticians are busily working on estimates of coverage. Every one of the operations in this program was completed on time and under budget. We believe we've saved about $30 million dollars because of the fine work of the field workers and some real breakthroughs on our matching techniques that we are enjoying the benefits of.

We, as you know, complete an independent listing of addresses on a sample of areas. Then we do a lot of follow-up to make sure we understand discrepancies we appear to have found between the census and the post-enumeration survey. For example, on example of this of an unresolved status is those people who move between the time they were counted in the census and the time that they were interviewed in the post-enumeration survey. And what we do there is a lot of follow-up efforts to understand that mobility so that we estimate the differential undercounts appropriately.

We also, for the first time—a good thing about this census' study is that we are attempting to identify duplicates across counties and states. This is a pretty massive, computer assisted effort that will effort that will hopefully improve our estimates on the backend. We have a few, initial finding already. The percentage match of housing units based on the post-enumeration survey is higher in 2010 that it was in 2000. That's a good indicator. The percentage of units that were verified as correct enumerations in the 2010 Census that was higher than in 2000. We like that result. The percentage of housing units found to be duplicates are lower in 2010 than in 2000. And that, too, is a good thing.

At the person level we know that the computer match rate is higher than the comparable rate in 2000. And that is good as well. You should look for these findings no later than July 31, 2012. We will have a larger array of results from this post-enumeration survey than ever before. We will produce but net error in components of coverage properties. We are going to break it by geography, state level estimates, regional level estimates. We are going to have net error estimates down to the county level when the counties have more than 100,000 people in them. And we are going to break the estimates by various demographic groups as is traditional.

The new things that we are doing holds promise for building a better 2020 Census and a more cost efficient 2020 Census. We will also have under count, differential under count estimates by various operational categories, including the type of the enumeration area, the bilingual mailing areas, replacement forms and so on. And this will really help us plan our next operations.

So let me sum up on the evaluative side of things. At this stage we are still waiting for the post-enumeration survey findings that will happen in the middle of next year. But at this stage the vast majority of the quality indicators are positive. We have some negative. But the density of the information suggests that we're in good shape relative to the 2000 census. Those are my comments on the evaluation of the 2010 Census.

Let me move to something that is also occupying our staff and that is the Count Question Resolution Program. This is the moment every decade when local officials look at their counts by block and they see what, in their mind are anomalies between what they expected the counts to be and what we gave them. So there is a program that has been set up for several censuses called the Count Question Resolution Program where local official submit to the Census Bureau their concerns, down to the address level.

And there are three reasons that we can act and change things. Sometimes the boundaries of a jurisdiction that we have in our files is not the boundary appropriate to January 1, 2010, which is what the specified boundary time is. And we can move population counts and housing unit counts from jurisdictions into the appropriate boundaries.

The second reason that changes can be made has to do with geocoding corrections. Probably the best example of this has to do with the group quarters. Sometimes we place a structure like an assisted living facility in the wrong block.

And in our data, therefore, the population count is wrong for two blocks. One has too many; one has too few. And we can move that group quarters into the appropriate block.

And then, finally, from time to time there are processing errors that are made after the enumeration step, where we erroneously delete a unit that had population and a feeling that it might have been a duplicate of something. So, for those three reasons we can make changes. Now, it is important to note that we can't do one thing that some local officials would want and that is, re-compute the local population of April 1, 2010. We can't do that. That population no longer exists.

So we can't do field work that produces recounts. We started accepting challenges on June 1. If you go to our Web page, we are trying to be transparent on this. Every Monday on our Web page we update the list of jurisdictions that have submitted challenges. You can all see that every Monday updated. So far we have received about 60 challenges to the 2010 Census counts. They come from 23 states as well as the District of Columbia.

Comparing this to 2000, we don't have exactly the right figures we want but this is basically the same ballpark that we got in 2000. There is nothing extraordinary about the volume. We can look back at 2000 and note that about half of all the challenges were received in the first nine months of the program and then things tailed off somewhat. So we're expecting most of them to come in over the next few months and we will report—we would be happy to report or you could go to the Web page to see what that count is.

The CQR process itself is a laborious one. I want to give you a few of the details to explain one attribute of it. On average it takes 120 to 150 days to process these challenges. And let me give you a sense why. If a jurisdiction challenges a boundary, we have to go back and review the legal ordinances and compare our

geographical data base with those ordinances and make sure that every address has been assigned to the right geography and, therefore, the right jurisdiction.

If we are researching a geocoding challenge, we have to determine if an address identified in the census was appropriate identified and placed in the right block. Then we use all the records and documentation we can to determine if it need to be moved to a different tabulation block.

And then finally, on a coverage challenge, one where we may have made a processing error, we have to go back several steps to find cases in question to make sure they were, indeed, processed correctly or we find and error. That takes a while. I can note that we sent back the first resolved challenge on July 28th. We found in Maharishi Vedic City, Iowa that we did, indeed, miss-assigned housing units and group quarters. The challenge resulted in a population increase for that jurisdiction. We had to move counts from one jurisdiction into that, a population that we reported as 259 and it became 1,294. And other jurisdictions adjacent to that lost populations.

So, to all we should note that this program stays open for a long time. You can submit challenges through June 1, 2013. And we want to get this right. So anything that doesn't look right to local jurisdictions we love to be reminded of. So that's there we are in the count question resolution.

I just want to look forward a bit. I noted that we've completed all the summary file ones that give all sorts of interesting cross tabulations of data down to the block level for all the states. We are going to start issuing things that we call Census Briefs on the white population and the black population and then on the housing stock in September. You'll see reports like this. Well tell you, we will summarize those and give you updates on that.

I probably should have noted that we have just released the population counts for the island areas of American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and the US Virgin Islands. Those were released yesterday. And then, finally, we have a big release coming up in September, a few big releases from the American Community Survey. In September we will release the 2010 ACS one-year estimates.

Now, let me give you a heads up about those estimates. Now this will be another moment where people could get confused about the difference between the American Community Survey and the decennial census. We will be releasing American Community Survey 2010 estimates that reflect the entire year as that survey covers the entire year versus the census, which reports the population as of a particular day, April 1, 2010. So there will be differences between them for that reason. We also note that the estimates from the American Community Survey are based on a sample. They will have sampling variability attached to them that we will report.

But we also note that the ACE is more and more important to the country because of its use for a variety of Federal program decisions and allocations of funds. It is the way, by the way, that all of us, most importantly American business makes decisions about site location, market attractiveness and so on. So, it's an important release in September.

So those are my remarks. I'm happy to now take questions.

STAN ROLARK: Okay. So let me just say a little bit about questions today. So what we will do is first take a question from the room and then we will go from the room to the phone. So do we have any questions in the room? And when you give your question, if you would give you name and your immediate affiliation as well—we do have one question in the room. We a mic coming to you.

NICHOLAS BALLASY: Nicholas Ballasy with CNS News. I have a question about the information technology problems that were reported by the Inspector General of the Commerce Department continuously throughout the count. Did the IT problems affect the accuracy of the 2010 Census count?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: From a scientific viewpoint that's a tough question because we didn't realize the census without the IT problems so we don't have an empirical contrast. But I can tell you that for all of those problems as the IG (?) report notes, we had fallback systems that were either developed or used to do the functional equivalent of those functions.

So, there were scary moments, as I have reported in the 2010 operation where the processing of paper forms was slower than we wanted. The backend of that caught up nicely. We did follow-up no the non-response stuff. The most critical, or the easiest criticism I think that could be made is that we may have delay or we did delay a quality control step to detect any unusual patterns of response in non-response follow-up cases. So we detected them late.

This would involve, for example, any falsification of data on the part of an enumerator. We caught those but we caught those later than we would have if we have not had computer problems. But everything we caught we completely redid that work with a different enumerator. But that's a fair commentary on potential effects. We think that affected our evaluation of the census as opposed to the quality of the data themselves.

STAN ROLARK: Okay. And thank you for that question. Let's move and see if we have anything on the phone. Operator, are there any things on the phone, any questions on the phone?

OPERATOR: No questions at this time.

STAN ROLARK: Okay. Do we have another question in the room? Carol?

CAROL MORELLO: Carol Morello from the Washington Post. At this point in time, Dr. Groves, what budget cuts are you making or anticipating?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: As you know or as you may not know, our submission for the fiscal year 2012 budget included a large series of cuts that we took internally. We made some tough decisions because we realized that this was a tough budget year coming up. So, for example, we, under the 2012 submission terminated the current industrial reports sequence that is a set of important estimates for manufacturers and other businesses in the economy. We terminated the Statistical Abstract Program that been going on for many, many, many decades.

And we made a variety of other administrative cuts. We also have closed a data center. We have reduced our IT costs by efficiencies in both software purchases and maintenance contracts in major ways that were multi-million dollar savings. So we went into the budget with a trimmed down budget. As you may know, at the House Appropriations Subcommittee our mark is even a larger cut that amounts to, in addition to that, about 11 percent cut, a 16 percent added cut of the periodic programs.

So what does that mean? The periodic programs involve the decennial census. They are periodic because the budgets go up and down over time. This press conference is about the decennial census. That goes up on a 10-year cycle. But we also have two—we have five year cycles that involve the economic census. We are just entering the ramp-up phase for the economic census in 2012. And under the cuts proposed, that's threatened, we must admit.

That's an important vehicle for the computation of Gross Domestic Product. I can give you a sense that in the benchmark years, so the 2012 year, about 90 percent of the GDP components come from those census data. So, we're trying to react to these kinds of cuts now. This is the House mark and we're trying to see how best to use the taxpayer money and get the most information we can. But these are trying times.

STAN ROLARK: Thank you for that question. Operator, do we have a question on the phone?

OPERATOR: Yes. It comes from Hope Yen from the Associated Press.

HOPE YEN: Yes. Hi, Hope Yen from the AP here. I was just wondering regarding the detailed comparisons you made and talked about, the DA numbers to the 2010 Census, at least by age. At this point, is there a sense or an assessment in terms of what it might say about accuracy at least for the very young age groups in which we historically have seen differences?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Well, I think most demographers and, actually, most people who are not doing demographic analysis but are looking at censuses have interpreted that classic difference between higher demographic analysis counts or estimates versus the population counts from a census as a probably a source of weaknesses in censuses. It's a problem that exists in every country whose data I've seen. It's a tough problem because it has to do with how people interpret what we're asking of them when we give them a census form.

And it's clear that for some, children are neglected in the filling out of the form, not because they don't think of them as a part of the family but they don't connect them with the census request.

Now we are getting better, I think, over censuses in reminding people, don't forget new babies in the household and so on. But these initial findings suggest that this is a tough social problem of measurement.

HOPE YEN: Okay. And I'm wondering, you talked a little bit about the 65 and older, which I understand is still being reviewed. But I mean, I'm trying to get a better sense what might be the implications is the feeling that maybe the DA numbers might have some weaknesses because of how they are differently measured between them?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Yeah, I think—I mean we don't know, to be honest and people. And people are on this problem right now. We are fascinated by it. It was a surprise. I remind us in the treatment of the 65-plus in the Medicare, you know, we have really hard numbers of Medicare enrollment. But then we have to have another number, right, what percent of those 65 and older are not enrolled in Medicare.

And we're just entering the Baby Boom—or we're in this process where the Baby Boom is transitioning into Medicare eligibility. And it could be that the take-up rate is different for this cohort for some reason than early cohorts. So that's one hypothesis we're looking at. But you can also notice, you know, if you go back that chart, there is also a much higher census counts pre-65. So that's what we are trying to figure out right now. We literally don't know.

We gave you these figures as we promised, you know, sort of as soon as we had them so everybody knows everything at the same time. But we haven't figured out the why yet on that.

HOPE YEN: Okay. Thanks.

STAN ROLARK: Okay. Thanks for the question. Do we have another question in the room? I think we have one more question on the phone. Operator, do we have another question there?

OPERATOR: Yes. The next question comes from Aldeth Lewin with the Virgin Islands Daily News.

ALDETH LEWIN: Hi. Good afternoon. We just got our population counts for the territories released yesterday. And I was just wondering how the territory's response rate, if the territory's response rate factors into the national response rate at all—because I know we are counted separately in so many different ways. And if not, I didn't see anywhere in the data what the territory's response rate was. And I was wondering if you could speak to that.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Yeah. One the first question, I'm pretty sure that the rates that I just gave you at the beginning of this conference do not reflect the Island areas. You should have them—I don't have these with me. And I think if you called the PIO office, the Public Information Office of Census we could dig those up for you and give them for your story.

ALDETH LEWIN: Great. Thank you.

STAN ROLARK: And if you wish to call the Public Information Office, that number is 301-763-3030. Certainly feel free to give us a call if you have any questions, on the Virgin Islands or anything else.

ALDETH LEWIN: Thank you.

STAN ROLARK: Do we have any other questions in the room? Operator, any questions on the phone?

OPERATOR: No further questions.

STAN ROLARK: Let me just give you a little more information before we break up. A few additional items are coming out in September. September is really going to be a pretty busy month for data and for information. We have the official statistics for income, poverty, and health insurance information coming out on September 13th. We are going to do a Webinar so all of you will get information through Media (?) Advisory prior to that.

In addition, Dr. Groves talked about the ACS data that is coming out. We are also going to do a Webinar then. That data, the public release will be on the 22nd. We will do a Webinar prior to that release as well. So if you have any questions, you can certainly ask during that period of time. Again, go to our Web site, www.census.gov for general information. Dr. Groves mentioned CQR. If you want to get that, if you want to find the information on CQR you can go to www.2010census.gov . And then you will see an icon there for "about." So if you click that, you will get that information.

So with that, operator, has anyone else indicated they have a question?

OPERATOR: No further questions.

STAN ROLARK: Well, with that we will end this today. Thanks all for participating. We certainly appreciate your interest in the 2010 Census and the Census Bureau. Thank you.

END OF MEETING